



The Task Force on Court Facilities  
303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, CA 94107-1366  
**Meeting Report**  
Future Needs / Projections Committee Meeting  
October 7, 1998  
Clarion Inn, Sacramento, CA

<b>TASK FORCE ATTENDEES:</b>	<b>PRESENTERS:</b>
<b>COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</b>	Mr. Mike Thomas, Justice Planning Associates
<b>PRESENT:</b>	<b>TASK FORCE STAFF:</b>
Mr. Anthony Tyrrell, Chair	Mr. Robert Lloyd – Project Coordinator / Senior Facilities Planner
Mr. Wylie A. Aitken	
Hon. Joan B. Bechtel	<b>GUESTS:</b>
Mr. John A. Clarke	Mr. Rubin Lopez, California State Association of Counties (partial attendance)
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Mr. Tom Lutzenberger, Department of Finance
Ms. Yvonne Campos	

- I. Mr. Tyrrell opened the meeting at 10:30 a.m.
- II. Mr. Mike Thomas, the consulting team's "Phase 3 – Projections" phase leader, began by presenting the statistical data collection sources and methodology that is being employed by Justice Planning Associates in developing a workload and space forecasting model for the California Courts. Mr. Lloyd, who joined the group after discussion began, interjected that the purpose of the committee meetings was not only an update on consultant progress but also discussion and agreement on the committee's charter and operating procedures.
- III. Discussion then turned to the organizational structure and procedures adopted by the Task Force and of the committee's charter.
  - 1) Members expressed concern that important issues could be decided in committees and never raised to the Task Force as a body. The use of committees could keep members from participating in discussion and decision making on issues that they felt strongly about or had particular expertise in. Mr. Lloyd stated that the committee structure actually increased the number of issues that the Task Force could consider in depth and that it was incumbent upon each committee to raise significant and or controversial issues to the Task Force level. In addition, procedures should be adopted to ensure that these issues are elevated to the Task Force. Possible procedures include:
    - a) Regular meetings of the Executive Committee (Composed of the Task Force chair and the chairs of the committees) where the activities of each committee are discussed, direction confirmed, and minutes prepared and circulated.
    - b) Regular presentations to the Task Force on the key issues, activities and decisions of the committees.
    - c) Staggering meetings so that members may attend committee meetings other than their own.
    - d) Allowing Task Force members to participate in discussion of any issue the comes before any committee.
    - e) Keeping and circulating comprehensive committee meeting minutes.
  - 2) They also questioned whether the three committees (standards/evaluation, future needs/projections) reflected the ideal breakdown of Task Force responsibilities. Members also expressed concern that the charters of the different committees may overlap.

- IV. The committee next discussed its charter. Mr. Lloyd stated that he felt the committee's charter covered two very important, but substantially different, functions:
- 1) Oversight of the consultant's data collection efforts; ensuring that the consultant's methodology was logical, sound and applied in a consistent manner. In addition, the Task Force needs to ensure that the information collected was consistent with that collected for similar studies and projects conducted by the AOC and any other agency; most notably the AOC's Court Profiles Project. If inconsistent, the reason for the variance must be understood. It should be the committee's responsibility to develop, with the consultant, workload and space forecasts for the courts that are reasonable and defensible and to present them to the Task Force for action.
  - 2) The committee should also look at the potential changes to the court systems that would mitigate the courts' facilities needs. The committee might look at organizational and operational issues that might mitigate space requirements as well as the future direction of technology in the courthouse. The committee might also examine the impact of unification on the number and location of court facilities. Some members thought that the function of the Task Force was to develop specific recommendations on how to correct problems in existing courts and plan for their future. There was not a clear understanding of the committee's role in the development of workload forecasting models and projecting the courts future space needs. They felt that oversight of statistical information was better performed by staff than a committee. They also felt that the issues discussed above might overlap with the responsibilities of the Standards and Evaluation committee and questioned the need for a Projection/Future Needs Committee. The members felt that the Executive Committee, or the Task Force needed to re-examine the charter of this committee and perhaps absorb its responsibilities into the other two committees. At the same time, they questioned whether there may be a need for some, as yet unidentified, other committees.
- V. Mr. Thomas continued with his presentation on the progress made in projecting the courts future facility needs. He explained the different projection techniques that were used to predict future workload, how information was aggregated into composite projections, and when information was discounted and not used to project. Mr. Thomas also noted that predicting the impact of unification was critical to his ability to forecast future facilities needs. He emphasized that he would need guidance on unification shortly.



The Task Force on Court Facilities  
303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, CA 94107-1366